

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/536,618	03/28/2000	Toyokazu Fujii	43889-929	5999
20277 7590 05/17/2004 MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY 600 13TH STREET, N.W.			EXAMINER	
			PHAM, HOAI V	
	N, DC 20005-3096		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2814	
			DATE MAILED: 05/17/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No. Applicant(s)					
Office Action Summary		09/536,618	FUJII ET AL.	ØX.			
		Examiner	Art Unit				
		Hoai V Pham	2814				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply							
THE - Extended - If the - If No - Fail - Any	HORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Ensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 or SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. The period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply compared period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period was the reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONED	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communica O (35 U.S.C. § 133).	ation.			
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 M	larch 2004 .					
2a) <u></u>	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This	s action is non-final.		•			
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims							
<u> </u>	Claim(s) 39-56 is/are pending in the application	ា.					
, - /	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw		•				
5) []	Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
·	Claim(s) 39-56 is/are rejected.			•			
	Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. Application Papers							
- -	The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
11) The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.							
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.							
12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.							
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120							
13)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).							
a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:							
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.							
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. <u>09/018, 181</u> .						
* (3. Copies of the certified copies of the priori application from the International Bure See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).					
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).							
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received. 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.							
Attachmen	•			,			
2) Notice	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)		(PTO-413) Paper No(s)atent Application (PTO-152)	<u>.</u> •			

Art Unit: 2814

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claim 56 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The recitation "the insulating film includes phosphorus at a concentration of 3.0 wt% or more" is not described in the specification. (see applicant's specification page 41 for detail).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Art Unit: 2814

4. Claims 39-54 and 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kuroda [U.S. Pat. 6,255,685] newly cited.

With respect to claims 39, 41, and 51, Kuroda (fig. 32, cols. 10-14) discloses a semiconductor device comprising:

a substrate (261) having a semiconductor region (see col. 10, lines 58-60); an insulating film (319) formed on said semiconductor region and having a property of reflowing due to a heat treatment under predetermined conditions, and the insulating film (319) comprising phosphorus (see fig. 32 and col. 13, lines 46-53);

a silicon oxide film (320) formed on said insulating film (see fig. 32 and col. 13, lines 54-55);

a silicon nitride film (321) formed on said silicon oxide film (see fig. 32 and col. 13, lines 56-57);

a contact hole (270) formed through said silicon nitride film, said silicon oxide film and said insulating film (see fig. 32 and col. 14, lines 12-16); and

a contact electrode (322) formed in said contact hole, wherein the entire lower surface of said silicon oxide film is in contact with the upper surface of said insulating film (see fig. 32 and col. 14, lines 16-17).

With respect to claim 40, Kuroda discloses that the insulating film (319) includes impurities (see col. 13, lines 45-50).

With respect to claim 41, Kuroda discloses that the insulating film (319) includes phosphorus (see col. 13, lines 45-50).

Art Unit: 2814

With respect to claims 42 and 56, Kuroda discloses that the insulating film (319) includes boron (see col. 13, lines 45-50).

With respect to claim 43, Kuroda discloses that the insulating film (319) includes boron and phosphorus (see col. 13, lines 45-50).

With respect to claims 44-46 and 53, Kuroda discloses that the insulating film (319) is planarized (see fig. 32).

With respect to claims 47-50 and 54, Kuroda discloses that the entire lower surface of said silicon nitride film (321) is contacted with the upper surface of said silicon oxide film (320) (see fig. 32).

With respect to claim 52, Kuroda discloses that the contact electrode (322) is in contact with the insulating film (319) (see fig. 32).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 6. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was

Art Unit: 2814

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. Claim 55, as best understood, is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuroda [U.S. Pat. 6,255,685] newly cited, in view of Douglas [U.S. Pat. 4,807,016] newly cited.

Kuroda does not explicitly disclose the insulating film (319) includes phosphorus and boron at concentration of 3.0 wt% or more. However, Douglas discloses that it is known in the art for the insulating film (BPSG) including phosphorus and boron at concentration of 3.0 wt% or more (see col. 1, lines39-43). Moreover, the concentration range would have been obvious to an ordinary artisan practicing the invention because, absent evidence of disclosure of criticality for the range giving unexpected results, it is not inventive to discover optimal or workable ranges by routine experimentation. *In re Aller*, 220 F.2d 454, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955). Furthermore, the specification contains no disclosure of either the critical nature of the claimed dimensions of any unexpected results arising therefrom. Where patentability is aid to be based upon particular chosen dimensions or upon another variable recited in a claim, the Applicant must show that the chosen dimensions are critical. See *In re Woodruff*, 919 F.2d 1575, 1578, 16 USPQ2d 1934, 1936 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 39-56 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

- 9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hoai V Pham whose telephone number is 571-272-1715. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30A.M. - 8:00P.M..
- 10. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wael M. Fahmy can be reached on 571-272-1705. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.
- 11. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Hoai Pham

May 12, 2004